

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9                   WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
10                  AT SEATTLE  
11

12                 TERENCE JONES,

13                  Plaintiff,

14                  v.

15                  MELANIE R. CHEAIRS et al.,

16                  Defendants.

17                  CASE NO. 2:23-cv-01730-LK

18                  ORDER DISCHARGING ORDER  
19                  TO SHOW CAUSE AND  
20                  EXTENDING TIME FOR SERVICE

21                  This matter comes before the Court sua sponte. On July 1, 2024, the Court issued an order  
22                  to show cause why the case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to serve  
23                  because Plaintiff Terence Jones had not served Defendants within 90 days as required by Federal  
24                  Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m). Dkt. No. 8 at 1–2. The Court ordered Mr. Jones to respond within  
25                  30 days of the order, *id.* at 2, making his response due by August 1, 2024. The Court received his  
26                  response to the order to show cause on August 7, 2024. Dkt. No. 9 at 1. In light of Mr. Jones' pro  
27                  se status, the Court accepts the late filed response but cautions him that any further violations of  
28                  the Court's orders and/or rules may result in sanctions.

Turning to the substance of his response, Mr. Jones requests additional time to serve Defendants due to his “economic status” and “health issues.” *Id.* at 2, 4. The Court must extend the 90-day service period upon a showing of good cause and, absent such a showing, retains broad discretion to dismiss the action or extend the period for service. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m); *In re Sheehan*, 253 F.3d 507, 512 (9th Cir. 2001); *Efaw v. Williams*, 473 F.3d 1038, 1041 (9th Cir. 2007). “[I]f good cause is not established, the district court may extend time for service upon a showing of excusable neglect.” *Lemoge v. United States*, 587 F.3d 1188, 1198 (9th Cir. 2009).

Here, although Mr. Jones' references to his economic status and health issues are vague, the Court finds good cause to extend the deadline for service until September 20, 2024. Mr. Jones must file proof of service on all Defendants by that day. Otherwise, the Court may dismiss this matter without prejudice for failure to prosecute.

Finally, Mr. Jones' response requests that the Court "allow[] the case to move forward with one or more of the following" and lists a series of sometimes conflicting relief, such as allowing him to amend his complaint and staying the case. Dkt. No. 9 at 5.<sup>1</sup> It is unclear what exactly he is seeking, but regardless, the Court will not grant relief absent a motion. *See LCR 7.* Any future request for relief must be in a motion that is sufficiently supported and in compliance with applicable Court rules.<sup>2</sup>

Dated this 12th day of August, 2024.

Lauren King  
Lauren King  
United States District Judge

<sup>1</sup> The Clerk of the Court has reissued summons as Mr. Jones requested. *Id.*; Dkt. Nos. 10, 11.

<sup>2</sup> The United States District Court for the Western District of Washington's "Pro Se Guide," [https://www.wawd.uscourts.gov/sites/wawd/files/ProSeManual4\\_8\\_2013wforms.pdf](https://www.wawd.uscourts.gov/sites/wawd/files/ProSeManual4_8_2013wforms.pdf), provides guidance for pro se litigants on various topics, including the service requirement.